

ATTACHMENT 1

| CCR Tracking Number | Originating CLEC (Region) | CLEC Primary Contact Name | Interface Affecting | Status | Date Received |
|---|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|---------------|
| CCRAM 02-011 | Choice One | Linda Peterman | Ordering (LEX, EDI) | Pending Review in 2/2003 | 6/11/02 |
| <p>CLEC Verbatim Description: Choice One, supported by multiple other CLECs, requests that functionality be added to LSOG5 (and above) to provide SBC with the capability of unrejecting Invalid System Rejects. Since CLECs must currently resolve such issues via resubmission of the effected orders manually, the impact to production, and therefore the CLEC's bottom line, is potentially enormous. In addition, ownership for resolution of these types of rejects should be on SBC, rather than on the CLEC.</p> <p>This functionality existed in prior LSOG versions and was omitted from LSOG5 with the stated premise that SBC would direct its efforts toward expeditiously resolving the related defect as opposed to "fixing" specific order issues. The reality is that the CLEC Community has not seen the promised speed to resolution.</p> <p>In addition, Performance Measure data is currently being (from the CLECs' perspective) adversely impacted. Invalid System Rejects are being "counted" as CLEC errors. This certainly brings the validity of Performance Measure Data into question.</p> | | | | | |
| SBC Response/Update: | | | | | |
| 2/21/03 – This topic was discussed on the action item log. Please refer to Action Item #1 from 12/5/02 for the details of that discussion. | | | | | |
| 12/6/02 – Change Management reported that the SBC SMEs had met once on this but needed additional time to determine how large a project this would be. The SMEs will provide a response in the January meeting. Status will be changed to Pending. | | | | | |
| 11/27/02 – This will be addressed at the December 5 th meeting. | | | | | |
| 11/7/02 – Barb Scheiderer from CoreComm asked several questions about this request. She asked when was the first notification made to the CLECs of this process change. Change Management responded that it was made in the first Change Management meeting prior to the April 20, 2002 POR release in Ameritech. She inquired how this was determined to be "best practice" from among all the SBC regions. Change Management replied that this capability never existed in any of the other regions and this was discussed in the Collaboratives and identified there as something that would not be carried past POR. She asked if there were any PMs that were affected. Change Management replied that they were unsure because PMs are not a part of this forum. CLECs felt that PMs 5 and 9 were affected. CoreComm wants back the ability to unreject auto-auto invalid rejects. Change Management has brought this request to the attention of Glen Sirles, VP-OSS. He has indicated that this would be such a massive effort that no other work could be done in a future release if this were taken on. CoreComm asked to be able to do email rather than faxes as the workaround to not being able to unreject. Change Management reported that Glen supports this completely. SBC must make some internal changes first, but is already looking at getting that done. | | | | | |
| 7/11/02 – Change Management reported that the Collaboratives focused on unrejecting manual rejects, and this process is in place in all regions. SBC is concerned about how universal a problem this is. Any changes made to SBC systems could adversely impact some CLECs' own systems. It is major rework for SBC. The originator disagreed with Change Management's statements that unrejecting was discussed only for manual rejects in the Collaboratives. Change Management stated that this request would be deferred until April 2003 and SBC would begin looking at it again at that time. | | | | | |
| 6/20/02 – Four CLECs said in the meeting that the DRs were not getting fixed fast enough and that they still struggled daily with the fallout caused by the invalid system rejects. Change Management replied that the real solution to this problem is to fix the DRs faster, not diverting resources to re-code the unreject capability. | | | | | |
| 6/13/02 – Change Management is investigating this request. | | | | | |
| 6/11/02 – New CCR added to the log. | | | | | |

ATTACHMENT 2

**All Regions Change Management Process
Action Item Log
(Updated as of March 14, 2003)**

Current Action Items:

| Number | Action Item | Initiator/ Owner | Status | Comments |
|-----------------|---|---|---------|---|
| 3 – 11/07/02 | <p>SBC will investigate the outage notification problems reported by the CLECs regarding EDI Pre-Order CSI/CSR functionality and provide information at the next AR CMP meeting.</p> <p>12/5/02 CMP Meeting:</p> <p>NEW ACTION ITEM: SBC to work with Availability Team and IS Call Center to look into systems that should be monitored by the A-Team and to ensure that there are no gaps in the process.</p> | <p>RCN/ TalkAmerica/ AT&T/ SBC</p> | Pending | <p>3/14/03 – No new status.</p> <p>2/20/03 CMP Meeting – SBC stated that the internal team is still meeting on this and there is nothing new to report. RCN asked if Network outage notifications are also being addressed by this team. SBC responded that Network outage notifications are handled by another group. The Broadcast Notifications deal with OSS interfaces such as CORBA and EDI. The team is looking into whether there are other wholesale systems, such as middleware, that the Availability Team should be getting notification so it can be tracked in the Broadcast Notification process. TalkAmerica stated that it did not receive notification for a pre-ordering system that was down for one and one-half hours. TalkAmerica called the IS Call Center and was told that there was no trouble ticket open on it and SBC would check into the problem. TalkAmerica said that the system then began to work mysteriously. TalkAmerica expressed concern that CLECs are not advised of the root cause for the systems being down. TalkAmerica stated that there are occasions that the system begins to work while TalkAmerica is on the phone with the IS Call Center. SBC responded that it may have been the middleware problem and the representatives were not aware that they needed to go to Vantive, SBC's internal trouble ticket reporting/tracking system. The Vantive system is updated with current status of the trouble ticket. The OSS Support Managers have access to Vantive to look up status. SBC stated that when a trouble ticket is open in Vantive, the trouble ticket number assigned is the same as that provided to CLECs when they call into the MCPSC or the IS Call Center to get the trouble ticket number.</p> <p>2/14/03 - SBC internal team is still meeting.</p> |

**All Regions Change Management Process
Action Item Log
(Updated as of March 14, 2003)**

Current Action Items:

| Number | Action Item | Initiator/ Owner | Status | Comments |
|--------|-------------|---------------------|--------|--|
| | | | | <p>1/16/03 CMP Meeting – SBC stated that no target date for completion of the review has been established. TalkAmerica and WorldCom stated that they did not receive a Broadcast Notification for a pre-ordering system that was down this week. They will send specific information on the outage to the CMP mailbox.</p> <p>1/10/03 – SBC internal team is in place that is looking into this.</p> <p>12/5/02 CMP Meeting - At RCN's complaint of the notification process during a recent outage of the EDI Pre-Order CSI/CSR functionality, Kathy King reported that investigation indicated no systemic problems in the broadcast notification process. The problem was with middleware; however, it is possible that the Availability team was not aware of the problem until after it was resolved. The team does not monitor middleware.</p> <p>ACTION ITEM: SBC to work with Availability Team and IS Call Center to look into systems that should be monitored by the A-Team and to ensure that there are no gaps in the process.</p> <p>11/22/02 – Will provide update at December All Regions CMP meeting.</p> <p>11/7/02 CMP Meeting - RCN reported that it had experienced a problem with the notification process during a recent outage of the EDI Pre-Order CSI/CSR functionality. RCN stated that there was no initial notification and the resolution notice was issued late. TalkAmerica stated that the System Status web site wasn't posted for the outage and AT&T stated that when the resolution was issued it did not state it was for CORBA, so the accuracy was also at fault.</p> |

**All Regions Change Management Process
Action Item Log
(Updated as of March 14, 2003)**

Current Action Items:

| Number | Action Item | Initiator/ Owner | Status | Comments |
|-----------------|--|---------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| | | | | <p>SBC responded that it believed the outage had to do with the Middleware problems in the AIT region; it will investigate.</p> <p>ACTION ITEM: SBC will investigate the outage notification problems reported by the CLECs and provide information at the next AR CMP meeting.</p> |
| 1 – 12/05/02 | SBC will add the discussion on Invalid System Rejects (CCR #AM02-011) to the January All Regions CMP meeting agenda. | CoreComm/ SBC | Pending Reference CCR AM02-011 | <p>3/14/03 – Status to be provided at the March CMP meeting.</p> <p>2/20/03 CMP Meeting – SBC stated that its track record for Version 5 is better and its track record for closing DRs is better with 5. In order to justify the expense of making a system modification, SBC has developed a report for invalid system rejects in 5. The LSC representatives have been trained to identify and capture this data. A DSS report will be produced and the results will be shared with CLECs over the next few CMP meetings. There was discussion regarding how the information would be tracked, whether a supp would be sent through manually, whether it would be sent with comments in the REMARKS field, and if it would be sent to a special fax number. AT&T expressed two concerns. The first, AT&T stated that SBC needs to re-assess its decision to get rid of the process to unreject rejects in the Midwest region and not implementing this capability in SBC's other regions. AT&T stated that yesterday, it had 1,000 orders fall into this category. The alternative is to accept the rejected orders and process manually, which is not an efficient way to operate. The second concern raised by AT&T relates to how this situation is captured in the performance measures. SBC responded that AT&T's second concern has been escalated to Glen Sirles and it will be addressed outside of CMP. SBC stated that with respect to AT&T's first concern, that SBC</p> |

**All Regions Change Management Process
Action Item Log
(Updated as of March 14, 2003)**

Current Action Items:

| Number | Action Item | Initiator / Owner | Status | Comments |
|--------|-------------|-------------------|--------|--|
| | | | | <p>prefers to fix the edit than to develop the capability to unreject. SBC will have to check on the details of the type of information that would be captured. ChoiceOne and CoreComm stated that this was not resolved in the six-month performance measure review. They were told by regulatory in the Midwest region that SBC was manually accounting for these. ChoiceOne stated that it was told by SBC that it was not aware of a mechanical way to capture the data, and it was originally escalated to the officer level. ChoiceOne stated that it is still SBC's error, but CLECs are having to do manual work to correct the problem. TalkAmerica asked if the information would be shown by CLECs so they can validate the information internally. AT&T stated that it would be helpful. SBC responded that it would most likely provide the information by CLECs if SBC creates a DSS. DCS asked how information on any work around would be captured. SBC responded that it would have to find out. SBC suggested that once the first report is produced, it can be reviewed and discussed. WorldCom stated that it sent a spreadsheet to its OSS Support Manager if the information would be helpful. WorldCom stated that it does not have a way to handle it manually.</p> <p>2/14/03 - An update will be provided at the 2/20 CMP meeting.</p> <p>1/16/03 CMP Meeting – SBC stated that it had worked with a number of internal groups to analyze this request, looking at the issue from an IT perspective, M&P, and training. The analysis concluded that it would be very complicated and involve a significant amount of time to implement. Based on the various components involved in this request, it is estimated between \$500,000 to \$750,000 and a development cycle of 9 to 12 months. SBC does not think this is a good business</p> |

**All Regions Change Management Process
Action Item Log
(Updated as of March 14, 2003)**

Current Action Items:

| Number | Action Item | Initiator/ Owner | Status | Comments |
|-----------------|---|---------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>decision.</p> <p>CLECs disagreed with SBC's position, reminding SBC that the primary issue is when SBC has coded incorrectly, not incorrect data on an LSR. SBC agreed to go back to the SMEs with CLECs concerns and return in February with a response.</p> <p>1/10/03 - Update to be provided at the January meeting.</p> <p>12/5/02 CMP Meeting - In reference to CoreCom's request for additional review of CCR Issue #AM02-011 (Unrejecting Invalid System Rejects) SBC had agreed to have an IT representative at the December meeting to discuss "Un-reject Functionality". Due to scheduling conflicts, it was not possible to have a spokesperson at the December meeting; SBC announced that this issue will be addressed at the AR CMP meeting January 16th (meeting will be held in Chicago).</p> <p>ACTION ITEM: Add discussion on Invalid System Rejects to the January agenda.</p> |
| 4 - 12/05/02 | SBC to check on order system limitations related to its hours of availability in the AIT and SNET regions - limitations in the queue. | WorldCom/ SBC | Request Closure Reference CCR03-005 & CCR03-006 | <p>3/14/03 - SBC will ask to close this action item.</p> <p>2/20/03 CMP Meeting - SBC stated that a response was provided directly to WorldCom. WorldCom has submitted two CCRs and this will also be tracked in the CCR log. WorldCom requested to leave this action item open until its new CCRs were discussed.</p> <p>2/14/03 - An update will be provided at the 2/20 CMP meeting.</p> <p>1/16/03 CMP Meeting - The OSS Support Management team is currently researching this issue and expects to complete its research shortly. A response will</p> |

**All Regions Change Management Process
Action Item Log
(Updated as of March 14, 2003)**

Current Action Items:

| Number | Action Item | Initiator/ Owner | Status | Comments |
|-----------------|---|---------------------|--|---|
| | | | | <p>be provided directly to WorldCom, and an update will be provided in the action item log. AT&T requested clarification on whether the queuing limitation is only applicable to WorldCom or if it applies to all CLECs.</p> <p>1/10/03 – Update to be provided at the January meeting.</p> <p>12/5/02 CMP Meeting - WorldCom complained that SBC's hours of availability, specifically in the AIT and SNET regions, are not adequate to process their order production on Sundays. It went on to state that on a Sunday it could only submit 4000 orders maximum. SBC responded that it would check on system limitations. (Note: WorldCom has been working with Mary Potter, Marilyn White and Jennifer Chevis of SBC on this complaint.)</p> <p>ACTION ITEM: SBC to check on order system limitations in the AIT region – limitations in the queue.</p> |
| 6 – 01/16/03 | SBC will ensure the new prioritization process is documented in the Change Management Process document. | ChoiceOne/ SBC | Pending | <p>3/14/03 – Update to be provided at the March CMP meeting.</p> <p>2/20/03 CMP Meeting – CLECs requested to leave this action item open.</p> <p>2/14/03 - It is on the list of updates. SBC will ask to close this action item.</p> |
| 9 – 01/16/03 | <p>2/20/03 Revised Action Item: SBC will revise its prior versioning document to outline its current proposal and distribute via Accessible Letter within the next couple of weeks. SBC will include a statement in the Accessible Letter that this versioning proposal will be discussed at the next CMP meeting.</p> <p>1/16/03 Original Action Item: SBC will schedule a</p> | CLECs/ SBC | Pending Reference CCR 02- 007 | <p>3/14/03 – Due to the March release, the subject matter experts were not available. This will be discussed at the April CMP meeting.</p> <p>2/20/03 CMP Meeting – SBC stated that it did not want to arrange another meeting with the versioning SMEs if there has been no change in the positions. SBC stated that a significant amount of resources, time, and</p> |


**All Regions Change Management Process
Action Item Log
(Updated as of March 14, 2003)**

Current Action Items:

| Number | Action Item | Initiator/ Owner | Status | Comments |
|------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------------|---|
| | <i>follow-up meeting to discuss versioning.</i> | | | <p>expense were required to develop the current versioning strategy. SBC built versioning per collaborative agreements. In order for SBC to consider making changes to the current versioning method, CLECs would need to agree to a compromise. WorldCom stated the document SBC provided for review at the last versioning meeting was misleading. WorldCom stated that SBC's document included three options in its proposal. However, during the meeting, it was made clear that there was only one option it would support. SBC responded that the document could have been made more clear by stating that these were the three options discussed previously. WorldCom suggested that SBC revise the document it previously distributed to show SBC's current proposal with its two options, the current versioning strategy and the SBC versioning proposal. SBC agreed to revise the prior document outlining its current proposal. SBC will distribute the revised document via Accessible Letter within the next couple of weeks. In addition, SBC will include a statement in the Accessible Letter that this proposal will be discussed at the next CMP meeting. It was agreed to change the language of this action item to reflect the new request by CLECs. Covad asked if the revised versioning document would address the new CCR it submitted. TalkAmerica stated that it had submitted a CCR previously and offered to talk to Covad off-line.</p> <p>2/14/03 - SBC will host a call on versioning if CLECs feel there will be some movement from previous position.</p> |
| 10 - 01/16/03 | SBC will check into providing a list of the third party vendors it uses that impact CLECs, along with the name and version of the software being used. | TalkAmerica/ SBC | Request Closure | <p>3/14/03 – The information will be posted on 3/20 under the Connectivity tab at the EDI/CORBA Support web site (https://clec.sbc.com/clec_edisupport/). Reference Accessible Letter CLECALLS03-031. SBC</p> |

**All Regions Change Management Process
Action Item Log
(Updated as of March 14, 2003)**

Current Action Items:

| Number | Action Item | Initiator/ Owner | Status | Comments |
|------------------|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | <p>will ask to close this action item.</p> <p>2/20/03 CMP Meeting – SBC stated that it has received legal and vendor approval to provide this information. Currently SBC's internal Corporate Communication group is reviewing this to see if there are impacts to any corporate policies, as in logos. After receiving the go ahead from Corporate Communications, the information will be posted to the web site and sent via Accessible Letter. Going forward, an Accessible Letter will be distributed notifying CLECs of any changes and the information will be updated and posted to the web site. It was agreed to leave this action item open until the information is distributed via Accessible Letter and is posted to the web site.</p> <p>2/14/03 - SBC agrees to do this and the information should be posted before the March CMP meeting.</p> |
| 12 - 01/16/03 | <p>SBC will discuss the following request regarding pre-order from AT&T with the testing team and provide a response at the next CMP meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow CLECs to test when they need/want to test, without SBC involvement; OR • Have CLECs submit a test plan each month, and allow CLECs to test against a particular test case more than one time. | AT&T, TalkAmerica, & McLeodUSA/ SBC | Monitor Review at July CMP Meeting | <p>2/20/03 CMP Meeting – A summary of SBC's proposal to CLEC requested changes and responses to suggestions/questions presented at the 2/7/03 conference call are attached below. Also included are additional questions/discussion from the CMP meeting.</p> <p> "0220 CMP Mtg AI 12_011603F.doc"</p> <p>2/14/03 – A conference call was held on 2/7/03 to discuss CLEC requested changes to the pre-order testing process (Accessible Letter CLECALLS03-016 distributed 2/3/03). An update will be provided at the 2/20 CMP meeting.</p> |
| 13 - | McLeodUSA/CLECs will send to the CMP mailbox, a list | McLeodUSA/ | Request | 3/14/03 – No feedback received from CLECs. SBC |

**All Regions Change Management Process
Action Item Log
(Updated as of March 14, 2003)**

Current Action Items:

| Number | Action Item | Initiator/ Owner | Status | Comments |
|-----------------|--|----------------------|----------------------------|---|
| 01/16/03 | of fields for which a note/reference should be included in the LSOR/LSPOR as to where to obtain the information in the Handbook. | McLeodUSA & CLECs | Closure | will ask to close this action item. 2/20/03 CMP Meeting – SBC stated that it has not yet received any comments from CLECs. 2/14/03 – Pending feedback from CLECs. |
| 5 – 02/20/03 | SBC will look into the possibility of including the testing window matrix and if approved, will include it with the revised 12-Month Development View before distributing with the minutes of this meeting. | WorldCom/ SBC | Pending | 3/14/03 – Update to be provided at the March CMP meeting. |
| 6 – 02/20/03 | SBC will check to see if any of the projects listed on the current requested flow-through projects page has been committed to a release and indicate such on the revised version of the 12-Month Development View before it is posted to the web site. | Birch/ SBC | Pending | 3/14/03 - Update to be provided at the March CMP meeting. |
| 7 – 02/20/03 | SBC will check into the notification process for IDL model changes. | AT&T/ SBC | Request Closure | 3/14/03 – Any changes to the IDL structures fall under the CMP and follow the same notification timelines. If SBC needs to make a change outside of the quarterly releases, SBC would use the exception request process. SBC will ask to close this action item. |

All Regions Change Management Process Action Item Log

Closed Action Items:

| Number | Action Item | Initiator/ Owner | Status | Comments |
|-----------------|---|---------------------|--------------------------|---|
| 1 – 02/20/03 | SBC will revise the 12-Month Development View to include both Accessible Letter number references regarding the retirement of PBSM before distributing with the minutes of this meeting. | SBC/ SBC | Closed 3/6/03 | 3/5/03 – The 12-Month Development View has been revised to include the Accessible Letter numbers. |
| 2 – 02/20/03 | SBC will revise the 1Q03 section of the 12-Month Development View to include a note that the retirement of W-CIWIN (pre-ordering app to app) has been delayed to 2Q03 before distributing with the minutes of this meeting. | SBC/ SBC | Closed 3/6/03 | 3/5/03 – The 12-Month Development View has been revised to include a note that the retirement of W-CIWIN (pre-ordering app to app) has been delayed to 2Q03. |
| 3 – 02/20/03 | SBC will revise the 2Q03 section of the 12-Month Development View to show that the retirement date of W-CIWIN (ordering GUI) is 6/30/03 before distributing with the minutes of this meeting | SBC/ SBC | Closed 3/6/03 | 3/5/03 – The 12-Month Development View has been revised to show that the retirement date of W-CIWIN (ordering GUI) is 6/30/03. |
| 4 – 02/20/03 | SBC will revise the 12-Month Development View to include a version retirement notation for the 1Q03 and 2Q03 releases before distributing with the minutes of this meeting. | AT&T/ SBC | Closed 3/6/03 | 3/5/03 – The 12-Month Development View has been revised to include a version retirement notation for the 1Q03 and 2Q03 releases. |

ATTACHMENT 3



Accessible

SBC Ameritech
Bell

SBC Nevada Bell

SBC Pacific Bell

SBC SNET

SBC Southwestern

Date: **November 8, 2002**

Number: **CLECALLS02-138**

Effective Date: **November 11, 2002**

Category: **OSS**

Subject: **Universal Service Order Code (USOC) Search Tool Header Modification**

Related Letters:

Attachment **No**
:

States **All Regions**
Impacted:

Response Deadline: **NA**

Contact: **Change Management Mailbox at**
sbccmp@camail.sbc.com

Conference Call/Meeting: **NA**

This Accessible Letter provides notification of modifications to the Universal Service Order Code (USOC) Search Tool.

Effective November 11, 2002, the following note will be added to the header on the USOC Search Tool:

Note: The USOC Search Tool returns data to be used when submitting SBC Local Service Requests (LSRs) for LSOR version 05.01 and above.

Please direct any additional questions to your Account Manager or the Change Management mailbox.

ATTACHMENT 4

[mailto:jb7983@sbc.com]
From: BRYAN, JANICE J (SWBT)
Sent: Wednesday, October 09, 2002 3:22 PM
To: Willard, Walter W (Walt), NCAM;
Webber, Rebecca L,
NCAM
Cc: TEMPLE, MELONIE (SWBT)
Subject: RE: AIT LSOG 5 Directory
Listing question

For SWBT for Resale/UNE-P and Facility-based
CLEC Non Pub
applies to Main
Listings. However, in AIT I recently found
out that Non-pub
can apply to
additional listings. The issue is being researched in AIT.
For example
Telemangement Services may have Joint User/Client Main listing as Non Pub.
For facility-based CLECs additional NP
listings would not
apply. Again this
is being researched.
Once we get the accounts from AT&T we will
be in a better
position to
address your concerns.
Janice Bryan
Account Manager - Industry Markets
214 464-1053- Voice

ATTACHMENT 5

-----Original Message-----

From: Willard, Walter W (Walt), NCAM
Sent: Wednesday, October 09, 2002 5:04 PM
To: 'BRYAN, JANICE J (SWBT)'; Webber, Rebecca L, NCAM
Cc: TEMPLE, MELONIE (SWBT)
Subject: RE: AIT LSOG 5 Directory Listing question

Janice,
The attached file of examples has 2 sections all of which
are LAL - non pub,
I'm told. The total number of this sample is about 860.
Hope this helps.
Walt
<<LAL File.txt>>

ATTACHMENT 6

```

#ifndef ansi_t1_267_IDL
#define ansi_t1_267_IDL

//|-----
//| Directives
//|-----

#pragma prefix "t1.org"

//|-----
//| MODULE ansi_t1_267
//|-----

module ansi_t1_267 {

    module LSOG6 {

//|-----
//| MODULE LpoType
//|-----

        module LpoType {

//|-----
//| Definitions - Generic
//|-----

            typedef sequence<string> StringSetType;

            union StringSetTypeOpt switch(boolean) {
                case TRUE: StringSetType theValue;
            };

            union StringTypeOpt switch(boolean) {
                case TRUE: string theValue;
            };

            struct ExtensionType {
                string          theTag;
                string          theValue;
            };

            typedef sequence<ExtensionType> ExtensionSetType;

            union ExtensionSetTypeOpt switch(boolean) {
                case TRUE: ExtensionSetType theValue;
            };

            struct StringExtType {
                string          theValue;
                ExtensionSetTypeOpt extensions;
            };

            typedef sequence<StringExtType> StringExtSetType;

            union StringExtSetTypeOpt switch(boolean) {
                case TRUE: StringExtSetType theValue;
            };

```

```

};

struct LengthType {
    string          theValue;
    StringTypeOpt   theUnit;
    ExtensionSetTypeOpt extensions;
};

union LengthTypeOpt switch(boolean) {
    case TRUE: LengthType theValue;
};

// |-----
// | Service Address
// |-----

struct SvcAddrType {
    StringTypeOpt   SAPR;
    StringTypeOpt   SANO;
    StringTypeOpt   SANOR;
    StringTypeOpt   SASF;

    StringTypeOpt   SASD;
    StringTypeOpt   SASN;
    StringTypeOpt   SASS;
    StringTypeOpt   SATH;

    StringTypeOpt   LD1;
    StringTypeOpt   LV1;
    StringTypeOpt   LD2;
    StringTypeOpt   LV2;
    StringTypeOpt   LD3;
    StringTypeOpt   LV3;

    StringTypeOpt   CITY;
    StringTypeOpt   STATE;
    StringTypeOpt   ZIPCODE;

    StringTypeOpt   AAI;
    StringTypeOpt   AFT;
    StringTypeOpt   CAI;
    StringTypeOpt   CS;
    StringTypeOpt   DSIND;
    StringTypeOpt   FTWP;
    StringTypeOpt   LALOC;
    StringTypeOpt   LSO;
    StringTypeOpt   LST;
    StringTypeOpt   NPANXX;
    StringTypeOpt   WSOPI;
    StringTypeOpt   WTN;
    ExtensionSetTypeOpt extensions;
};

union SvcAddrTypeOpt switch(boolean) {
    case TRUE: SvcAddrType theValue;
};

```

```

typedef sequence<SvcAddrType> SvcAddrSetType;

union SvcAddrSetTypeOpt switch(boolean) {
    case TRUE: SvcAddrSetType theValue;
};

// |-----
// | Listed Address
// |-----

struct ListAddrType {
    StringTypeOpt    LAPR;
    StringTypeOpt    LANO;
    StringTypeOpt    LASF;

    StringTypeOpt    LASD;
    StringTypeOpt    LASN;
    StringTypeOpt    LASS;
    StringTypeOpt    LATH;

    StringTypeOpt    LALOC;
    StringTypeOpt    LAST;
    StringTypeOpt    LAZC;

    StringTypeOpt    LALO;
    StringTypeOpt    LISTADR;
    ExtensionSetTypeOpt extensions;
};

union ListAddrTypeOpt switch(boolean) {
    case TRUE: ListAddrType theValue;
};

// |-----
// | Delivery Address
// |-----

struct DelAddrType {
    StringTypeOpt    DDAPR;
    StringTypeOpt    DDANO;
    StringTypeOpt    DDASF;

    StringTypeOpt    DDASD;
    StringTypeOpt    DDASN;
    StringTypeOpt    DDASS;
    StringTypeOpt    DDATH;

    StringTypeOpt    LD1;
    StringTypeOpt    LV1;
    StringTypeOpt    LD2;
    StringTypeOpt    LV2;
    StringTypeOpt    LD3;
    StringTypeOpt    LV3;

    StringTypeOpt    CITY;
    StringTypeOpt    STATE;
    StringTypeOpt    ZIP;

```

```

        StringTypeOpt      LALO;
        StringTypeOpt      DELADR;
        ExtensionSetTypeOpt extensions;
    };

    union DelAddrTypeOpt switch(boolean) {
        case TRUE: DelAddrType theValue;
    };

//|-----
//| Definitions - All Scenarios
//|-----

// |-----
// | Response Codes/Desc
// |-----

    struct ResponseInfoType {
        StringTypeOpt      RESPC;
        StringTypeOpt      RESPD;
        StringTypeOpt      PRESPC;
        StringTypeOpt      PRES PD;
        ExtensionSetTypeOpt extensions;
    };

    typedef sequence<ResponseInfoType> ResponseInfoSetType;

    union ResponseInfoSetTypeOpt switch(boolean) {
        case TRUE: ResponseInfoSetType theValue;
    };

// |-----
// | Network
// |-----

    struct NetworkInfoType {
        StringTypeOpt      NC;
        StringTypeOpt      NCI;
        StringTypeOpt      SECNCI;
        ExtensionSetTypeOpt extensions;
    };

    typedef sequence<NetworkInfoType> NetworkInfoSetType;

    union NetworkInfoSetTypeOpt switch(boolean) {
        case TRUE: NetworkInfoSetType theValue;
    };

//|-----
//| Definitions - CSI
//|-----

// |-----
// | Feature/FeatureDetail
// |-----

    struct FfdType {
        StringTypeOpt      FEATURE;
        StringTypeOpt      FEATUREDETAIL;
    };

```



```

        ExtensionSetTypeOpt    extensions;
    };

    typedef sequence<FfdType> FfdSetType;

    union FfdSetTypeOpt switch(boolean) {
        case TRUE: FfdSetType theValue;
    };

// |-----
// | Listed Text
// |-----
    struct ListedTextType {
        StringTypeOpt    LTXNUM;
        StringTypeOpt    LTXTY;
        StringTypeOpt    LTEXT;
        StringTypeOpt    LPHRASE;
    };

    typedef sequence<ListedTextType> ListedTextSetType;

    union ListedTextSetTypeOpt switch(boolean) {
        case TRUE: ListedTextSetType theValue;
    };

// |-----
// | Service
// |-----

    struct SvcInfoType {
// |-----
// | General details
// |-----
        StringTypeOpt    NAME;
        StringTypeOpt    WTN;
        StringTypeOpt    ECCKT;
        StringTypeOpt    SVCCFG;
// |-----
// | Pic details
// |-----
        StringTypeOpt    FPIC;
        StringTypeOpt    IPIC;
        StringTypeOpt    LPIC;
        StringTypeOpt    PIC;
// |-----
// | Hunting details
// |-----
        StringTypeOpt    HID;
        StringExtSetTypeOpt    HTSEQ;
        StringTypeOpt    HNTYP;
        StringExtSetTypeOpt    TERS;
// |-----
// | Feature/FeatureDetail details
// |-----
        FfdSetTypeOpt    FFDinfo;
// |-----
// | Did Trunk and Network details

```

```

// |-----
StringTypeOpt      RIN;
StringTypeOpt      DO;
StringTypeOpt      TGN;
StringTypeOpt      TKQ;
StringTypeOpt      TKID;
StringTypeOpt      LTLI;

StringTypeOpt      NC;
StringTypeOpt      NCI;
StringTypeOpt      SECNCI;
StringTypeOpt      CHANNEL;
StringTypeOpt      PUL;
StringTypeOpt      SGNL;
StringTypeOpt      SSIG;
// |-----
// | Blocking Exception details
// |-----
StringExtSetTypeOpt  BLOCK;
// |-----
// | Service Address details
// |-----
SvcAddrTypeOpt      SVCADDRinfo;
// |-----
// | Extensions
// |-----
ExtensionSetTypeOpt  extensions;
};

typedef sequence<SvcInfoType> SvcInfoSetType;

union SvcInfoSetTypeOpt switch(boolean) {
    case TRUE: SvcInfoSetType theValue;
};

// |-----
// | Listing
// |-----

struct ListingInfoType {
// |-----
// | General
// |-----
StringTypeOpt      LTN;
StringTypeOpt      NSTN;
// |-----
// | ContentAndFormat/Name
// |-----
StringTypeOpt      LISTNM;
StringTypeOpt      LNLN;
StringTypeOpt      LNFN;
StringTypeOpt      DES;
StringTypeOpt      NICK;
StringTypeOpt      TL;
StringTypeOpt      TITLE1;
StringTypeOpt      TITLE2;
StringTypeOpt      TLD;

```

```

        StringTypeOpt      TITLE1D;
        StringTypeOpt      TITLE2D;
// |-----
// | ContentAndFormat/ListingText
// |-----
        ListedTextSetTypeOpt  LISTINGTEXTinfo;
// |-----
// | ContentAndFormat/Telephone
// |-----
        StringTypeOpt      OMTN;
// |-----
// | ContentAndFormat/Format
// |-----
        StringTypeOpt      ADI;
        StringTypeOpt      STYC;
// |-----
// | ContentAndFormat/ListedAddress
// |-----
        ListAddrTypeOpt     LISTADDRinfo;
// |-----
// | Control/ListingID
// |-----
        StringTypeOpt      ALI;
// |-----
// | Control/Advertising
// |-----
        StringTypeOpt      YPH;
        StringTypeOpt      YPHV;
        StringTypeOpt      SIC;
// |-----
// | Control/MarketingUsage
// |-----
        StringTypeOpt      DML;
        StringTypeOpt      NOSL;
        StringTypeOpt      TMKT;
// |-----
// | Control/Sequencing
// |-----
        StringTypeOpt      DNA;
        StringTypeOpt      LNPL;
        StringTypeOpt      PLA;
// |-----
// | Control/DirectoryPlacement
// |-----
        StringTypeOpt      RTY;
        StringTypeOpt      LTY;
        StringTypeOpt      EOS;
        StringTypeOpt      TOA;
        StringTypeOpt      PROF;
// |-----
// | Control/DirectoryAssistance
// |-----
        StringTypeOpt      DLNM;
// |-----
// | Control/DirectoryPublishing
// |-----
        StringTypeOpt      NAME;

```

```

        StringTypeOpt      DIRIDL;
        StringTypeOpt      DIRSUB;
        StringTypeOpt      DIRNAME;
        StringTypeOpt      BRO;
        StringTypeOpt      WPP;
        StringTypeOpt      OMSD;
        StringTypeOpt      STR;
// |-----
// | Extensions
// |-----
        ExtensionSetTypeOpt extensions;
};

typedef sequence<ListingInfoType> ListingInfoSetType;

union ListingInfoSetTypeOpt switch(boolean) {
    case TRUE: ListingInfoSetType theValue;
};

// |-----
// | Delivery
// |-----
        struct DelInfoType {
            StringTypeOpt      DIRTYP;
            StringTypeOpt      DDQTY;
            StringTypeOpt      DIRID;
            StringTypeOpt      DIRQTYA;
            StringTypeOpt      DATY;
            StringTypeOpt      NAME;
            DelAddrTypeOpt      DELADDRinfo;
            ExtensionSetTypeOpt extensions;
        };

typedef sequence<DelInfoType> DelInfoSetType;

union DelInfoSetTypeOpt switch(boolean) {
    case TRUE: DelInfoSetType theValue;
};

// |-----
// | Account
// |-----
        struct AccountSectType {
            StringTypeOpt      ATN;
            StringTypeOpt      CS;
            StringTypeOpt      LST;
            StringTypeOpt      NAME;
            StringTypeOpt      SPECX;
            StringTypeOpt      TOS;
            StringTypeOpt      TT;
            StringTypeOpt      AN;
            StringTypeOpt      LSCP;
            SvcAddrTypeOpt      SVCADDRinfo;
            ExtensionSetTypeOpt extensions;
        };

union AccountSectTypeOpt switch(boolean) {

```

```

        case TRUE: AccountSectType theValue;
    };

//|-----
//| Definitions - LQ
//|-----

// |-----
// | F1
// |-----
    struct F1Type {
        StringTypeOpt      F1DL;
        StringTypeOpt      F1DT;
        ExtensionSetTypeOpt extensions;
    };

    typedef sequence<F1Type> F1SetType;

    union F1SetTypeOpt switch(boolean) {
        case TRUE: F1SetType theValue;
    };

// |-----
// | F2
// |-----
    struct F2Type {
        StringTypeOpt      F2DL;
        StringTypeOpt      F2DT;
        ExtensionSetTypeOpt extensions;
    };

    typedef sequence<F2Type> F2SetType;

    union F2SetTypeOpt switch(boolean) {
        case TRUE: F2SetType theValue;
    };

// |-----
// | Bridge Tap
// |-----
    struct BtapType {
        LengthTypeOpt      BTL;
        LengthTypeOpt      BTLEN;
        ExtensionSetTypeOpt extensions;
    };

    typedef sequence<BtapType> BtapSetType;

    union BtapSetTypeOpt switch(boolean) {
        case TRUE: BtapSetType theValue;
    };

// |-----
// | Load Coil
// |-----
    struct LcoilType {
        StringTypeOpt      LCT;

```

```

        LengthTypeOpt      LCL;
        LengthTypeOpt      LDSP;
        ExtensionSetTypeOpt extensions;
    };

    typedef sequence<LcoilType> LcoilSetType;

    union LcoilSetTypeOpt switch(boolean) {
        case TRUE: LcoilSetType theValue;
    };

// |-----
// | SubSegment
// |-----
    struct SubSegmentType {
        StringTypeOpt      GA;
        LengthTypeOpt      ILL;
        LengthTypeOpt      LLG;
        ExtensionSetTypeOpt extensions;
    };

    typedef sequence<SubSegmentType> SubSegmentSetType;

    union SubSegmentSetTypeOpt switch(boolean) {
        case TRUE: SubSegmentSetType theValue;
    };

// |-----
// | Segment
// |-----
    struct SegmentType {
        StringTypeOpt      LCI;
        StringTypeOpt      LC;
        StringTypeOpt      LCA;
        StringTypeOpt      CHANPAIR;
        StringTypeOpt      TRMED;
        LengthTypeOpt      LL;
        StringTypeOpt      LMSTAT;
        StringTypeOpt      TYCA;
        StringTypeOpt      CAPAC;
        StringTypeOpt      BOCAP;
        LengthTypeOpt      BOOFF;
        StringTypeOpt      BORES;
        StringTypeOpt      ABP;
        StringTypeOpt      BTQ;
        BtapSetTypeOpt      BTAPinfo;
        SubSegmentSetTypeOpt SUBSEGMENTinfo;
        ExtensionSetTypeOpt extensions;
    };

    typedef sequence<SegmentType> SegmentSetType;

    union SegmentSetTypeOpt switch(boolean) {
        case TRUE: SegmentSetType theValue;
    };

//|-----

```

///
General Request/Response

///

```
struct GeneralRequest {
    StringTypeOpt    TXNUM;
    StringTypeOpt    TXTYP;
    StringTypeOpt    TXACT;
    StringTypeOpt    DTSENT;
    StringTypeOpt    CC;
    StringTypeOpt    CCNA;

    StringTypeOpt    APPRD;
    StringTypeOpt    CS;
    StringTypeOpt    EAN;
    StringTypeOpt    EATN;
    StringTypeOpt    ECCKT;
    StringTypeOpt    HUNT;
    StringTypeOpt    LCS;
    StringTypeOpt    LNUM;
    StringTypeOpt    LOCCODE;
    StringTypeOpt    LNUM;
StringTypeOpt    LSO;
    StringTypeOpt    LST;
    StringTypeOpt    NPANXX;
    StringTypeOpt    QNR;
    StringTypeOpt    RESID;
    StringTypeOpt    TNTYPE;
    StringTypeOpt    TOS;
    StringTypeOpt    WTN;
    StringExtSetTypeOpt    FETAVA;
    NetworkInfoSetTypeOpt    NCNCI;
    StringExtSetTypeOpt    REQNUM;
    SvcAddrTypeOpt    SVCADDRinfo;
    ExtensionSetTypeOpt    extensions;
};

struct GeneralResponse {
    StringTypeOpt    TXNUM;
    StringTypeOpt    TXTYP;
    StringTypeOpt    TXACT;
    StringTypeOpt    DTSENT;
    StringTypeOpt    CC;
    StringTypeOpt    CCNA;
    ResponseInfoSetTypeOpt    RESPinfo;

    StringTypeOpt    ALTADDNUM;
    StringTypeOpt    CS;
    StringTypeOpt    DSIND;
    StringTypeOpt    EAN;
    StringTypeOpt    EATN;
    StringTypeOpt    ECCKT;
    StringTypeOpt    HNTRES;
    StringTypeOpt    LNUM;
    StringTypeOpt    RESID;
    StringExtSetTypeOpt    ALTLSO;
    StringExtSetTypeOpt    APPRES;
    StringExtSetTypeOpt    AVD;
```

```

        StringExtSetTypeOpt    FETAVA;
        StringExtSetTypeOpt    FRESP;
        StringExtSetTypeOpt    IPICLIS;
        StringExtSetTypeOpt    LPICLIS;
        StringExtSetTypeOpt    PICLIS;
        StringExtSetTypeOpt    SVCCFG;
        StringExtSetTypeOpt    TNRES;
        SvcAddrSetTypeOpt      SVCADDRinfo;
        ExtensionSetTypeOpt    extensions;
    };

//|-----
//| CSI Request/Response
//|-----

    struct CsiRequest {
        StringTypeOpt          TXNUM;
        StringTypeOpt          TXTYP;
        StringTypeOpt          DTSENT;
        StringTypeOpt          CC;
        StringTypeOpt          CCNA;

        StringTypeOpt          AGAUTH;
        StringTypeOpt          AN;
        StringTypeOpt          ATN;
        StringTypeOpt          AUTHNM;
        StringTypeOpt          DATED;
        StringTypeOpt          ECCKT;
        StringTypeOpt          SC1;
        StringTypeOpt          SC2;
        StringTypeOpt          WTN;

        SvcAddrTypeOpt          SVCADDRinfo;
        ExtensionSetTypeOpt    extensions;
    };

    struct CsiResponse {
        StringTypeOpt          TXNUM;
        StringTypeOpt          TXTYP;
        StringTypeOpt          DTSENT;
        StringTypeOpt          CC;
        StringTypeOpt          CCNA;
        ResponseInfoSetTypeOpt RESPinfo;

        AccountSectTypeOpt     ACCOUNTinfo;
        SvcInfoSetTypeOpt      SERVICEinfo;
        ListingInfoSetTypeOpt  LISTINGinfo;
        DelInfoSetTypeOpt      DELIVERYinfo;
        ExtensionSetTypeOpt    extensions;
    };

//|-----
//| LQ Request/Response
//|-----

    struct LqRequest {

```



```

StringTypeOpt      TXNUM;
StringTypeOpt      TXTYP;
StringTypeOpt      TXACT;
StringTypeOpt      DTSENT;
StringTypeOpt      CC;
StringTypeOpt      CCNA;

StringTypeOpt      LM;
StringTypeOpt      MS;
StringTypeOpt      NC;
StringTypeOpt      NCI;
StringTypeOpt      RESID;
StringTypeOpt      SMC;
StringTypeOpt      TOS;
StringTypeOpt      WTN;
SvcAddrTypeOpt     SVCADDRinfo;
ExtensionSetTypeOpt extensions;
};

struct LqResponse {
StringTypeOpt      TXNUM;
StringTypeOpt      TXTYP;
StringTypeOpt      TXACT;
StringTypeOpt      DTSENT;
StringTypeOpt      CC;
StringTypeOpt      CCNA;
ResponseInfoSetTypeOpt RESPinfo;

StringTypeOpt      AVD;
StringTypeOpt      AFS;
StringTypeOpt      DLCTYPE;
StringTypeOpt      DSSCP;
LengthTypeOpt      ELL;
StringTypeOpt      F1LPCP;
StringTypeOpt      F2LPCP;
StringTypeOpt      ILD;
StringTypeOpt      LLT;
StringTypeOpt      LM;
StringTypeOpt      LPAC;
StringTypeOpt      LSA;
StringTypeOpt      LST;
StringTypeOpt      NPANXX;
StringTypeOpt      PGPRES;
StringTypeOpt      RESID;
StringTypeOpt      RSUIND;
StringTypeOpt      RTF;
StringTypeOpt      SMC;
StringTypeOpt      SSC;
StringTypeOpt      TC;
StringTypeOpt      WCN;
StringTypeOpt      LCQ;
LcoilSetTypeOpt    LCOILinfo;
F1SetTypeOpt       Flinfo;
F2SetTypeOpt       F2info;
StringExtSetTypeOpt LOOPSTAT;
SvcAddrTypeOpt     SVCADDRinfo;
SegmentSetTypeOpt  SEGMENTinfo;

```

```

        ExtensionSetTypeOpt    extensions;
    };

//|-----
//| SBC - LQ Response
//|-----

// |-----
// | PlantSegmentInfo
// |-----
    struct PlantSegmentType {
        StringTypeOpt    PLNTSEGFN;
        StringTypeOpt    PLNTG;
        StringTypeOpt    PLNTTC;
        StringTypeOpt    PLNTLEN;
        ExtensionSetTypeOpt    extensions;
    };

    typedef sequence<PlantSegmentType> PlantSegmentSetType;

    union PlantSegmentSetTypeOpt switch(boolean) {
        case TRUE: PlantSegmentSetType theValue;
    };

// |-----
// | RepeaterInfo
// |-----
    struct RepeaterType {
        StringTypeOpt    RPETERLNG;
        StringTypeOpt    RPETERLYP;
        ExtensionSetTypeOpt    extensions;
    };

    typedef sequence<RepeaterType> RepeaterSetType;

    union RepeaterSetTypeOpt switch(boolean) {
        case TRUE: RepeaterSetType theValue;
    };

// |-----
// | SEGtype
// |-----
    struct SegFnType {
        StringTypeOpt    SEGFN;
        LengthTypeOpt    LFN;
        ExtensionSetTypeOpt    extensions;
    };

    typedef sequence<SegFnType> SegFnSetType;

    union SegFnSetTypeOpt switch(boolean) {
        case TRUE: SegFnSetType theValue;
    };

// |-----
// | SbcLqLoop

```

```

// |-----
struct SbcLqLoop {
    StringTypeOpt    AVD;
    StringTypeOpt    AFS;
    StringTypeOpt    DLCTYPE;
    StringTypeOpt    DSSCP;
    LengthTypeOpt    ELL;
    StringTypeOpt    F1LPCP;
    StringTypeOpt    F2LPCP;
    StringTypeOpt    ILD;
    StringTypeOpt    LLT;
    StringTypeOpt    LM;
    StringTypeOpt    LPAC;
    StringTypeOpt    LSA;
    StringTypeOpt    LST;
    StringTypeOpt    NPANXX;
    StringTypeOpt    PGPRES;
    StringTypeOpt    RESID;
    StringTypeOpt    RSUIND;
    StringTypeOpt    RTF;
    StringTypeOpt    SMC;
    StringTypeOpt    SSC;
    StringTypeOpt    TC;
    StringTypeOpt    WCN;
    StringTypeOpt    LCQ;
    LcoilSetTypeOpt  LCOILinfo;
    FlSetTypeOpt     Flinfo;
    F2SetTypeOpt     F2info;
    StringExtSetTypeOpt LOOPSTAT;
    SvcAddrTypeOpt   SVCADDRinfo;
    SegmentSetTypeOpt SEGMENTinfo;
    RepeaterSetTypeOpt REPEATERinfo;
    PlantSegmentSetTypeOpt PLANTSEGMENTinfo;
    SegFnSetTypeOpt  SEGFNinfo;
    ExtensionSetTypeOpt extensions;
};

typedef sequence<SbcLqLoop> SbcLqLoopSetType;

union SbcLqLoopSetTypeOpt switch(boolean) {
    case TRUE: SbcLqLoopSetType theValue;
};

// |-----
// | SbcLqResponse
// |-----
struct SbcLqResponse {
    StringTypeOpt    TXNUM;
    StringTypeOpt    TXTYP;
    StringTypeOpt    TXACT;
    StringTypeOpt    DTSENT;
    StringTypeOpt    CC;
    StringTypeOpt    CCNA;
    ResponseInfoSetTypeOpt RESPinfo;

    SbcLqLoopSetTypeOpt LQLOOPinfo;
    ExtensionSetTypeOpt extensions;
};

```

```

};

//|-----
//| SBC - CSI Summary
//|-----

// |-----
// | CsiSumType
// |-----
struct CsiSumType {
    StringTypeOpt    WTN;
    StringTypeOpt    BILLON;
    StringTypeOpt    CALLINGCARD;
    StringTypeOpt    TRUNK;
    ExtensionSetTypeOpt    extensions;
};

typedef sequence<CsiSumType> CsiSumSetType;

union CsiSumSetTypeOpt switch(boolean) {
    case TRUE: CsiSumSetType theValue;
};

// |-----
// | CsiSummaryResponse
// |-----
struct CsiSummaryResponse {
    StringTypeOpt    TXNUM;
    StringTypeOpt    TXTYP;
    StringTypeOpt    TXACT;
    StringTypeOpt    DTSENT;
    StringTypeOpt    CC;
    StringTypeOpt    CCNA;
    ResponseInfoSetTypeOpt    RESPinfo;

    StringTypeOpt    ATN;
    CsiSumSetTypeOpt    CSISUMinfo;
    ExtensionSetTypeOpt    extensions;
};

//|-----
//| Order Status/POS Request/Response
//|-----

// |-----
// | FeatureInfo
// |-----
struct OsFeatureType {
    StringTypeOpt    SECTION;
    StringTypeOpt    USOCFID;
    StringTypeOpt    FEATDES;
    StringTypeOpt    TYPE;
    ExtensionSetTypeOpt    extensions;
};

typedef sequence<OsFeatureType> OsFeatureSetType;

```

```

union OsFeatureSetTypeOpt switch(boolean) {
    case TRUE: OsFeatureSetType theValue;
};

// |-----
// | BulkWorkLoad
// |-----
    struct BulkWorkLoadType {
        StringTypeOpt    ACCESSAFTER;
        StringTypeOpt    ACCESSBEFORE;
        StringTypeOpt    ACTUALLENGTH;
        StringTypeOpt    DUEDATETIME;
        StringTypeOpt    ESTIMATEDJOBLENGTH;
        StringTypeOpt    ESTIMATEDSTART;
        StringTypeOpt    OPENIND;
        StringTypeOpt    SON;
        StringTypeOpt    SOSTATCD;
        StringTypeOpt    TRAVELTIME;
        ExtensionSetTypeOpt    extensions;
    };

typedef sequence<BulkWorkLoadType> BulkWorkLoadSetType;

union BulkWorkLoadSetTypeOpt switch(boolean) {
    case TRUE: BulkWorkLoadSetType theValue;
};

// |-----
// | Svc Order Detail
// |-----
    struct SoDtlType {
        StringTypeOpt    CC2;
        StringTypeOpt    SC1;
        StringTypeOpt    SOTYP;
        StringTypeOpt    REGION;
        StringTypeOpt    WTN;
        StringTypeOpt    ATN;
        StringTypeOpt    SON;
        StringTypeOpt    SODD;
        StringTypeOpt    SOCD;
        StringTypeOpt    PON;
        StringTypeOpt    SOPDT;
        StringTypeOpt    SOSTATCD;
        StringTypeOpt    SOSTATCAT;
        ExtensionSetTypeOpt    extensions;
    };

typedef sequence<SoDtlType> SoDtlSetType;

union SoDtlSetTypeOpt switch(boolean) {
    case TRUE: SoDtlSetType theValue;
};

struct OsRequest {
    StringTypeOpt    TXNUM;
    StringTypeOpt    TXTYP;
};

```

```

StringTypeOpt      TXACT;
StringTypeOpt      DTSENT;
StringTypeOpt      CC;
StringTypeOpt      CCNA;

StringTypeOpt      PON;
StringTypeOpt      WTN;
StringTypeOpt      ATN;
StringTypeOpt      ECCKT;
StringTypeOpt      PORDDF;
StringTypeOpt      PORDDT;
StringTypeOpt      SOPDT;
StringTypeOpt      SON;
StringTypeOpt      AGAUTH;
StringTypeOpt      RETRIEVEORDERS;
StringTypeOpt      CC2;

StringSetTypeOpt   SC1;
StringSetTypeOpt   REGION;
StringSetTypeOpt   FEATURE;
ExtensionSetTypeOpt extensions;
};

struct OsResponse {
StringTypeOpt      TXNUM;
StringTypeOpt      TXTYP;
StringTypeOpt      TXACT;
StringTypeOpt      DTSENT;
StringTypeOpt      CC;
StringTypeOpt      CCNA;
ResponseInfoSetTypeOpt RESPinfo;

StringTypeOpt      SON;
StringTypeOpt      WTN;
StringTypeOpt      ATN;
StringTypeOpt      APPLDT;
StringTypeOpt      SOCD;
StringTypeOpt      SODD;
StringTypeOpt      SOSFX;
StringTypeOpt      CUSCODE;
StringTypeOpt      CS;
StringTypeOpt      SOISSDT;
StringTypeOpt      SOSDD;
StringTypeOpt      SOSTATCAT;
StringTypeOpt      SOSTATCD;
StringTypeOpt      SOSTATDES;
StringTypeOpt      TYPID;
StringTypeOpt      SOPDT;
StringTypeOpt      ECCKT;
StringTypeOpt      NAME;
StringTypeOpt      CAI;
StringTypeOpt      AAI;
StringTypeOpt      APPTINFO;
StringTypeOpt      MSDAPT;
StringTypeOpt      ESTIMATEDMINUTES;
StringTypeOpt      EXCHCD;
StringTypeOpt      TICKET;

```

```

StringTypeOpt      TECHNICIAN;
StringTypeOpt      FIELDWORK;
StringTypeOpt      SOROUTE;
StringTypeOpt      DPA;
StringTypeOpt      RELEASED;
StringTypeOpt      FEATURES;
StringTypeOpt      CENTER;
StringTypeOpt      FAILEDTEST;
StringTypeOpt      MSDAPTDES;
StringTypeOpt      MSDAPTCAT;
StringTypeOpt      DAILYWORKLOADFORMC;
StringTypeOpt      GROUP;

BulkWorkLoadSetTypeOpt BULKWORKLOAD;
SoDtlSetTypeOpt      SVCORDERLISTinfo;
StringSetTypeOpt      SODETAIL;
StringSetTypeOpt      DISPATCHNOTES;
StringSetTypeOpt      REMARKS;
StringSetTypeOpt      FEATURES;
OsFeatureSetTypeOpt   FEATUREinfo;
ExtensionSetTypeOpt   extensions;
};

};

//|-----
//| Typedef's
//|-----

typedef LpoType::GeneralRequest      AsRequest;
typedef LpoType::GeneralResponse     AsResponse;

typedef LpoType::GeneralRequest      LiRequest;
typedef LpoType::GeneralResponse     LiResponse;

typedef LpoType::GeneralRequest      LaRequest;
typedef LpoType::GeneralResponse     LaResponse;

typedef LpoType::GeneralRequest      SaRequest;
typedef LpoType::GeneralResponse     SaResponse;

typedef LpoType::GeneralRequest      ScRequest;
typedef LpoType::GeneralResponse     ScResponse;

typedef LpoType::GeneralRequest      TnaRequest;
typedef LpoType::GeneralResponse     TnaResponse;

typedef LpoType::CsiRequest          CsiRequest;
typedef LpoType::CsiResponse         CsiResponse;
typedef LpoType::CsiSummaryResponse CsiSummaryResponse;

typedef LpoType::CsiRequest          DiRequest;
typedef LpoType::CsiResponse         DiResponse;

typedef LpoType::LqRequest           LqRequest;
typedef LpoType::LqResponse          LqResponse;
typedef LpoType::SbcLqResponse       SbcLqResponse;

```

```
typedef LpoType::OsRequest      OsRequest;
typedef LpoType::OsResponse     OsResponse;
```

```
typedef LpoType::OsRequest      PosRequest;
typedef LpoType::OsResponse     PosResponse;
```

```
///|-----
///| Interfaces
///|-----
```

```
interface LocationInquiry {
```

```
    void submit (
        in    LiRequest  req,
        out   LiResponse rsp);
```

```
};
```

```
interface TelephoneNumberAssignment {
```

```
    void submit (
        in    TnaRequest req,
        out   TnaResponse rsp);
```

```
};
```

```
interface ServiceAvailability {
```

```
    void submit (
        in    SaRequest  req,
        out   SaResponse rsp);
```

```
};
```

```
interface AppointmentScheduling {
```

```
    void submit (
        in    AsRequest  req,
        out   AsResponse rsp);
```

```
};
```

```
interface CustomerServiceInformation {
```

```
    void submit (
        in    CsiRequest req,
        out   CsiResponse rsp);
```

```
    void submitCsiSummaryToSBC (
        in    CsiRequest req,
        out   CsiSummaryResponse rsp);
```

```
};
```

```
interface LoopQualification {
```



```

void submit (
    in    LqRequest  req,
    out   LqResponse rsp);

void submitToSBC (
    in    LqRequest  req,
    out   SbcLqResponse rsp);

};

interface OrderStatus {

    void submit (
        in    OsRequest  req,
        out   OsResponse rsp);

};

.....
interface ProvOrderStatus {
.....
    void submit (
.....
        in    PosRequest  req,
.....
        out   PosResponse rsp);
.....
};

};

};

#endif

```

ATTACHMENT 7



Date: **March 14, 2003**

Number: **CLECAMS03-021**

Effective Date: **N/A**

Category: **OSS**

Subject: **Follow-up on Line Loss Notifications Sent in Error**

Related Letters: **CLECAMS03-019**

Attachment **No**
:

States **SBC Midwest Region 5-State**
Impacted:

Issuing SBC ILECS: **SBC Illinois, SBC Indiana, SBC Michigan, SBC Ohio and SBC Wisconsin
(collectively referred to for purposes of this Accessible Letter as "SBC
Midwest Region 5-State")**

Response Deadline: **NA**

Contact: **Account Manager**

Conference Call/Meeting: **N/A**

This is a follow-up to Accessible Letter **CLECAMS03-019** to provide CLECs with more information regarding the Line Loss Notification issue identified on 3/5/03 in the SBC Midwest Region 5-State. A fix for the problem was identified and was successfully deployed on March 7, 2003. Associated Line Loss Notifications have been validated as being correct since that time. The scenarios which were subject to the error were limited.

The problem occurred only when the following conditions existed and only in SBC Midwest Region 5-State:

- The winning CLEC had to be using LSOG 5
- The winning CLEC was converting only part of a multiline account, where the main TN used to identify the multiline scenario was being converted
- Under this scenario, another line that was not the original main TN gets repositioned on the remaining record to be the new main TN for the lines that remain with the existing carrier
- The system created an LLN for both the original main TN, which was correct, and the newly created main TN, which was not correct as it was not lost

The first occurrence of this problem was in May 2002, although it was not observed because of the limited occurrence of the scenario. The total count of all LLNs sent in error is 908. Thirty-eight CLECs received these LLNs. All affected CLECs will be contacted directly by their OSS Manager and provided specific information about their transactions and the volume affected.

ATTACHMENT 8



Accessible

Date: **March 21, 2003**

Number: **CLECAMS03-022**

Effective Date: **March 20, 2003**

Category: **OSS**

Subject: **Line Loss Notifications Sent In Error**

Related Letters: **CLECAMS03-019**
CLECAMS03-021

Attachment **No**
:

States **SBC Midwest Region 5-State**
Impacted:

Response Deadline: **NA**

Contact: **Account Manager**

Conference Call/Meeting: **N/A**

This Accessible Letter, related to letters **CLECAMS03-019** and **CLECAMS03-021**, is to provide final resolution of the Line Loss Notification issue identified on 3/5/03. The root cause of the issue was incorrect programming caused by human error. Test cases had also failed to identify the problem and have been enhanced to more thoroughly cover this scenario in the future. As communicated in those prior Accessible Letters, a program fix was identified to correct the problem, which was successfully deployed on March 7, 2003. Associated Line Loss Notifications have been validated as being correct since that time.

All affected CLECs have been contacted by their OSS Manager and provided specific information about their transactions and the volume affected. If you have any further questions, please contact your OSS Manager.

ATTACHMENT 9

From: HIMM, THOMAS O (PB) [mailto:th4767@sbc.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2003 4:41 PM
To: Willard, Walter W (Walt), CSLSM
Cc: BRYAN, JANICE J (SWBT)
Subject: RE: Line Loss Notices Sent in errors

Walt,

I was provided some further explanation regarding the AIT LLN issue as described in Accessible Letters CLECAM03-019 and CLECAM03-021.

As far as what triggered the system to send LLN on the new main TN.

This was caused by a coding error in the logic to create LLN of which we were not aware of prior to March 5, 2003. This coding error caused a LLN to be sent when a new main TN was being established while remaining with AT&T on a partial migration when the previous AT&T main TN was being converted to another CLEC.

For further detailed information on the fix.

The code was analyzed and new code was develop to address the scenario communicated above so only the correct LLN would be sent. It was thoroughly tested and then deployed. Monitoring the LLNs has continued, no additional instances of the above situation have been detected since the fix was applied on March 7, 2003.

I have also been advised that a final Accessible Letter will be sent and expect it to be released within the next day or two.

Tom

Thomas Himm

Area Manager - OSS Customer Support

925-824-5601 (office)

925-901-1540 (fax)

ATTACHMENT 10



Accessible

SBC Ameritech
Bell

SBC Nevada Bell

SBC Pacific Bell

SBC SNET

SBC Southwestern

Date: **September 19, 2002**

Number: **CLECALLS02-111**

Effective Date: **July 30, 2002**

Category: **OSS**

Subject: **Revised OSS Versioning Options as a Result of 13-State Discussion on Versioning**

Related Letters: **NA**

Attachment **No**

:

States **All States**
Impacted:

Response Deadline: **NA**

Contact: Change Management email box at
sbccmp@camail.sbc.com

Conference Call/Meeting: **Conference Call**

Date/Time: **Thursday, September 26th
1:00 CDT**

Bridge: **800-215-4958 Passcode: 234789#**

RSVP to: **NA**

By: **NA**

Attached to this Accessible Letter are the revised versioning options as discussed at the 2-day meeting in Dallas on September 12th and 13th. Please note that SBC has added a third option for your review.

A follow-up conference call will be held on September 26th. See details above.



Alternative Versioning
Strateg...

SBC Versioning Proposals – OSS

At the August 8, 2002 Change Management Meeting, CLECs presented SBC with several key items surrounding the current SBC versioning strategy. As discussed at the meeting, both parties were to have reviewed the discussion points prior to the September CMP meeting. SBC captured discussion items surrounding the following:

- CLECs ability to be on more than one version simultaneously
- SBC to convert all CLEC data when moving to a new version
- CLECs desire not to have to flash cut to a new version
- Version by OCN/Company code or by Trading Partner ID
- Version by Request Type and OCN
- Version by Trading Partner ID, Request Type and OCN

Note: As discussed, not all of the issues are compatible and are actually in conflict with one another.

In response to these discussion points, SBC held several internal meetings with key Subject Matter Experts. The result of those meetings was a proposal presented to the CLECs on September 12th and 13th. A recommendation was made for SBC to explore 2 variations of the original proposal, which are outlined in Options 1 and 2 below. After further review, SBC determined that Options 1 and 2 do not address all of the issues raised. As a result, another alternative was developed and outlined in Option 3 below.

It should be noted that the following points apply to all three options:

- Applies to EDI Ordering, EDI Pre-Order, and CORBA Pre-Order only.
- The Pre-Ordering GUI (Verigate) will not be versioned, and will always reflect the highest version of the Local Service Pre-Ordering Requirements (LSPOR).
- The Ordering GUI (LEX) will not be versioned, and will always reflect the highest version of the Local Service Ordering Requirements (LSOR).
- As stated above, the SBC GUI's will not be versioned. For the LEX GUI, SBC will continue to perform conversions over release weekends as is standard practice today.
- Manual Forms utilized by CLECs will follow the same guidelines as the GUIs. As such, they will not be versioned.
- After LSOR releases, all new LEX or Manual Forms requests will originate in the highest LSOR version.

SBC's proposal is also contingent upon SBC being allowed additional flexibility for flow-through enhancements to prior/existing versions of software. SBC may at their discretion implement additional flow-through in prior versions to realize operational efficiencies in processing CLEC requests.

The CLEC testing window will remain unchanged. CLECs will be allowed access to the test environment for EDI ordering, EDI/CORBA Pre-Ordering and LEX GUI testing 37 days prior to an OSS LSOR/LSPOR release.

EDI and CORBA Pre-order already allow CLECs to be on multiple versions simultaneously. Supported versions for Pre-order will match supported versions for Order.

If agreement is reached on Option 3, SBC proposes that the Versioning Enhancement be implemented with LSOG 6, which is currently scheduled for June 2003.

Option 1

- CLECs will be able to be on multiple versions simultaneously.
- Versioning for EDI Ordering will be controlled at the PON level instead of the CC level. This will require all activity related to a PON to remain in the same version. All notifications will be returned in the same version as the originating PON, and supplemental orders must be in the same version as the original.
- SBC will continue to maintain 3 versions of software; however, the 3 versions will always be the most recent LSOR/LSPOR releases, and will not necessarily include more than one major LSOG version.
 - With this scenario, 05.03 would retire in December 2003, rather than 06.00.
Example:
 - 05.03 – March, 2003 (Retires on December 2003 release date).
 - 06.00 – June, 2003
 - 06.01 – September 2003
 - 06.02 – December 2003
- SBC will allow CLECs 30 days post-implementation of a release to clear pipeline requests on a retiring version.
 - Example: In December 2003, version 05.03 will retire. Under this proposal, SBC would no longer accept new PONs in 05.03 effective with the 06.02 release date. For a period of 30 days, CLECs would be allowed to clear the pipeline of their existing pipeline requests. Any requests that remain in the pipeline at the end of the 30 days will be cancelled.
 - 05.03 – Retires 12/03, but accepts supplemental activity for an additional 30 days.
 - 06.00 – June, 2003
 - 06.01 – September 2003
 - 06.02 – December 2003
- CLECs will be required to pick either a single EDI version, the LEX GUI or FAX as a single option to receive Loss Notifications. CLECs using EDI will be required to update this option as versions retire.
- For EDI Ordering, SBC will require a change to the GSID (GS03 data element) when CLECs change versions. The version indicated by the GSID must match the version indicated in the RVER entry on the LSR. All orders within a GS envelope must be in the same version.
- Changes to the TPID (ISA06 data element) will not be necessary between versions. As documented in the SBC Interconnection Procedures document, SBC will continue to support 3 TPID/IP/PORT combinations.

Option 2

- CLECs will be able to be on multiple versions simultaneously.
- Versioning for EDI Ordering will be controlled at the PON level instead of the CC level. This will require all activity related to a PON to remain in the same version. All notifications will be returned in the same version as the originating PON, and supplemental orders must be in the same version as the original.
- SBC will continue to support 3 versions of software consisting of 2 LSOG versions with a single dot instance.
 - With this scenario, 06.00 would retire in December 2003, rather than 05.03.
Example:
 - 05.03 – March 2003
 - 06.00 – June 2003 (Retires on December 2003 release date).
 - 06.01 – September 2003
 - 06.02 – December 2003
- SBC would no longer accept New LSRs in the retiring version 60 days prior to the OSS release that would retire the version.
 - Example: With the December 2003 implementation, version 06.00 will retire. Under this proposal, SBC would no longer accept new PONs in 06.00 sixty days prior to the December 2003 release date (Approximately 4/2003). Between April and June, CLECs would have to clear the pipeline of their existing requests. Any pipeline requests remaining in the retiring version on the release date will be cancelled.
 - 05.03 – March 2003
 - 06.00 – June 2003 - Retires 12/03, but will no longer accept New LSRs in 4/2003.
 - 06.01 – September 2003
 - 06.02 – December 2003
- CLECs will be required to pick either a single EDI version, the LEX GUI or FAX as a single option to receive Loss Notifications. CLECs using EDI will be required to update this option as versions retire.
- For EDI Ordering, SBC will require a change to the GSID (GS03 data element) when CLECs change versions. The version indicated by the GSID must match the version indicated in the RVER entry on the LSR. All orders within a GS envelope must be in the same version.
- Changes to the TPID (ISA06 data element) will not be necessary between versions. As documented in the SBC Interconnection Procedures document, SBC will continue to support 3 TPID/IP/PORT combinations.

Option 3 - "New Proposal"

- CLECs will be able to be on multiple versions simultaneously.
- Versioning for EDI Ordering will be controlled at the PON level instead of the CC level. This will require all activity related to a PON to remain in the same version. All notifications will be returned in the same version as the originating

- PON, and supplemental orders must be in the same version as the original.
(Unless the originating order is from a retired version.)
- SBC will continue to maintain 3 versions of software, however, the 3 versions will always be the most recent LSOR/LSPOR versions and will not necessarily include more than one major LSOG version.
 - With this scenario, 05.03 would retire in December 2003, rather than 06.00.
Example:
 - 05.03 – March 2003 (Retires on December 2003 release date).
 - 06.00 – June 2003
 - 06.01 – September 2003
 - 06.02 – December 2003
 - All active pipeline data in the retiring version will be converted to the version specified by the CLEC. CLECs will be required to notify SBC of their specified version at least **45** days prior to release weekend. In the event that SBC is not notified, all active pipeline orders will be converted to the lowest (or oldest) valid LSOR version. Supplements for converted requests should be submitted in this new version.
 - Example: In December 2003, version 05.03 will retire. Under this proposal, SBC would no longer accept new PONs in 05.03 effective with the 06.02 release date. Over release weekend, SBC would do a database conversion of CLEC requests in 05.03 that were in the active pipeline.
 - 05.03 – Retires 12/03 – SBC converts any active pipeline request.
 - 06.00 – June, 2003
 - 06.01 – September 2003
 - 06.02 – December 2003
 - CLECs will be required to pick either a single EDI version, the LEX GUI or FAX as a single option to receive Loss Notifications. CLECs using EDI will be required to update this option as versions retire.
 - For EDI Ordering, SBC will require a change to the GSID (GS03 data element) when CLECs change versions. The version indicated by the GSID must match the version indicated in the RVER entry on the LSR. All orders within a GS envelope must be in the same version.
 - Changes to the TPID (ISA06 data element) will not be necessary between versions. As documented in the SBC Interconnection Procedures document, SBC will continue to support 3 TPID/IP/PORT combinations.

TENTATIVE RELEASE SCHEDULE

Retirements noted for Options 1 & 3:

June 2003:

06.00
05.03
05.02
03.06 (7-state SWB, PB, NB) - Retiring Version
04.02 (5-state AIT) - Retiring Version that "lives and dies" retires without conversion
CMIS 2.3 (SNET) - Retiring Version that "lives and dies" retires without conversion

September 2003:

06.01
06.00
05.03
05.02 - Retiring Version

December 2003:

06.02
06.01
06.00
05.03 - Retiring Version

March 2004:

06.03
06.02
06.01
06.00 - Retiring Version

June 2004:

07.00
06.03
06.02
06.01 - Retiring Version

ATTACHMENT 11

1 BEFORE THE
2 ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION
3
4 IN THE MATTER OF:)
5 ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION,)
6 On Its Own Motion,)
7) No. 01-0662
8 Investigation concerning)
9 Illinois Bell Telephone)
10 Company's compliance with)
11 Section 271 of the)
12 Telecommunications Act of 1996.)
13 Chicago, Illinois
14 February 5, 2003

15 Met pursuant to notice at 9:00 a.m.

16 BEFORE:
17 EVE MORAN, Administrative Law Judge.
18 APPEARANCES:

19 MS. LOUISE A. SUNDERLAND, MR. MARK ORTLIEB, and
20 MR. JOHN LENAHA
21 225 West Randolph Street, Suite 25-A
22 Chicago, Illinois 60606
23 Appearing for SBC of Illinois;
24
25 MR. DARRELL TOWNSLEY, MS. SHERRY LICHTENBERG
26 205 North Michigan Avenue, Suite 1100
27 Chicago, Illinois 60601
28 Appearing for WorldCom, Inc.;
29
30 ROWLAND & MOORE, by
31 MR. THOMAS ROWLAND
32 77 West Wacker Drive, Suite 4600
33 Chicago, Illinois 60601
34 Appearing for Cimco Communications, Forte
35 Communications, XO Illinois and Globalcom;

1 APPEARANCES: (CONT'D)

2 SCHIFF, HARDIN & WAITE, by
3 MR. OWEN E. MAC BRIDE
4 6600 Sears Tower
5 Chicago, Illinois 60606

6 -and-
7 MR. PETER HEALY
8 525 Junction Road, Suite 6000
9 Madison, Wisconsin 53717
10 Appearing for TDS Metrocom, LLC;

11 MR. ALLAN GOLDENBERG
12 69 West Washington Street, Suite 700
13 Chicago, Illinois 60602
14 Appearing for the Cook County State's
15 Attorney;

16 TABET, DI VITO, ROTHSTEIN, LLC, by
17 MR. GINO L. DI VITO
18 180 North LaSalle Street, Suite 1510
19 Chicago, Illinois 60601

20 -and-
21 MR. JESSE L. FENNER
22 1676 International Drive
McLean, Virginia 22102-4828
Appearing for BearingPoint;

MS. CHERYL HAMILL, MR. TIMOTHY CONNOLLY, and
MR. JOHN J. REIDY, III
222 West Adams Street
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Appearing for AT&T Communications;

MR. MATTHEW L. HARVEY, MR. SEAN R. BRADY, and
MS. NANCY WEBER
160 North LaSalle Street, Suite C-800
Chicago, Illinois 60601
Appearing for Staff of the ICC;

21

22

1 APPEARANCES: (CONT'D)

2 MR. ANDREW WALKER
3 1600 Market Street, Suite 1600
4 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103
5 Appearing for BearingPointe;

6 KERN & ASSOCIATES, by
7 MR. JOHN P. KERN
8 2300 North Barrington Road, Suite 400
9 Hoffman Estates, Illinois 60195
10 Appearing for the ICC.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 SULLIVAN REPORTING COMPANY, by
22 Steven T. Stefanik, CSR
Carla Camiliere, CSR

1 I N D E X

2 Witnesses: Cross

3 JOHN ERINGIS 2216,2336
MARY ANY QUINN 2240,
4 MS. LITCHTENBERG 2249,2336,2341,2364,2461,2491
MR. CONNOLLY 2264,2296,2313,2356,2404,2435,
5 2476,2482,2501,2516
MR. REIDY 2293,2310,2480
6 MR. HEALY 2334,2375
MS. WEBER 2336,2352,2438,2469,2509,2511
7 MR. ROLAND 2377,2448,2465,2467,2523

8

9 E X H I B I T S

10 Number For Identification In Evidence

11 Commission Phase II
Nos. 1 and 2

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 possibilities.

2 Q. The set of personnel at BearingPoint that
3 is in process, since we know it's not complete
4 somehow in process of validation of this retail
5 data, the same or part of the same group that is
6 involved in the PMR 5 replication activity?

7 MR. JOHN ERINGIS: Yes.

8 Q. So it's not a separate group it's the same
9 individuals and work group performing that?

10 MR. JOHN ERINGIS: Yes.

11 Q. Is that scheduled on the same project basis
12 internally within BearingPoint?

13 MR. JOHN ERINGIS: I'm not sure what you mean.

14 Q. I mean is there some staging going on here
15 where retail, you know, is done first or last or at
16 the same time as an equivalent set of data?

17 MR. JOHN ERINGIS: We're not able -- I don't
18 think we've been able to schedule our metrics work
19 that way.

20 Q. Okay.

21

22

1 CONTINUED CROSS-EXAMINATION

2 BY

3 MR. CONNOLLY:

4 Q. Going to AT&T's Question 26. I'm going to
5 have a couple follow-up questions from earlier
6 also.

7 MS. CARLA MORREALE: For criteria 4-28 in order
8 to conduct our testing of this criterion,
9 BearingPoint uses server order images from the SBC
10 Ameritech system as its basis for determining which
11 orders should have generated line loss
12 notifications.

13 As such, it utilizes data after
14 submission. Details regarding the actual order
15 processes employed by the CLECs involved are not
16 visible to this test.

17 Q. Did you submit the orders through the test
18 CLEC for these 5,316 lines?

19 MS. CARLA MORREALE: Some of the test CLEC
20 orders may be within that sample. And to the
21 extent that the test CLEC orders generated or were
22 to generate a line loss notification, they would

1 have been included in that sample.

2 Q. So there's live CLEC data and test CLEC
3 data?

4 MS. CARLA MORREALE: Right.

5 Q. You said server order --

6 MS. CARLA MORREALE: Service order images.

7 Q. That's on the SBC side of the world?

8 MS. CARLA MORREALE: That's correct.

9 Q. Into their service order system?

10 MS. CARLA MORREALE: That's correct.

11 Q. You did this testing during this one period
12 of time because -- can you explain the reasons for
13 doing that during June and not doing it over a
14 longer period of time or multiple times?

15 MS. CARLA MORREALE: The test involved the
16 extraction of a large amount of data from SBC
17 Ameritech systems for the analysis.

18 The data that was examined for June 2002
19 met or satisfied the testing criterion that was
20 under evaluation.

21 Once this criterion was met, testing
22 ceased.

1 the notices go out within one hour of line loss.

2 One hour. So whether it's one hour, five hours,
3 five days, it's a failure.

4 And that activity is against test CLEC
5 orders where we have the ability to monitor, know
6 precisely when we received the line losses, and
7 that type of stuff. We do that against --

8 Q. I see.

9 MR. JOHN PRENDERGAST: The other order, TVV
10 4-28, is a larger sample over a shorter period, and
11 that is commercial volume.

12 And what we're looking for there is
13 whether the loss notification that should have been
14 generated was generated and existed in the SBC
15 system and before you ask, we don't have anyway of
16 measuring whether it got sent. We know it got
17 generated, it lived in the system. And that's what
18 that test reports on.

19 Q. You said for MI 13, John, it's one hour.
20 Isn't it one day?

21 MR. JOHN PRENDERGAST: I would have to look,
22 Tim, to be sure.

1 MS. WEBER: It's going to one day. The
2 evaluation that they did was one hour.

3 MR. JOHN PRENDERGAST: If it's not one hour,
4 we'll get back to you.

5 My recollection is that it --

6 MS. CARLA MORREALE: I got it. One hour.

7 BY MR. CONNOLLY:

8 Q. With 4-28, which is the accuracy of the
9 line loss activity? Did your evaluation go to the
10 accuracy of the notice? Did you look at the notice
11 document as to what it contained to determine if
12 that was accurate?

13 MS. CARLA MORREALE: Yes, we did review the line
14 loss notification.

15 Q. For the accuracy of the content of that?

16 MS. CARLA MORREALE: Does it have the
17 appropriate CLEC, the appropriate telephone number,
18 et cetera.

19 Q. Appropriate dates, appropriate EDI formats?

20 MR. JOHN PRENDERGAST: No. Not -- it's an
21 internal table out of, at the time MOR/Tel that we
22 were pulling the data from.

1 So we're looking to see -- there's not
2 much in a line loss notification anyway, but
3 basically we are looking to see the proper CLEC
4 going to be notified and is the phone number there.
5 And it's a matching process that we do.

6 These orders should have generated it.
7 Then we go looking for loss notifications that
8 match those criteria.

9 Q. So I think that I understand that there's
10 another step or two after that table is generated
11 in which the SBC system reads those entries and
12 creates EDI message records for EDI CLECs and
13 populates the necessary information according to
14 those EDI standards or protocols, and that -- and
15 then sends those messages to the CLECs?

16 MS. CARLA MORREALE: You're correct.

17 Q. And you don't have any opinion about how
18 reliable that process is or if that process even
19 works of that formatting and presentation of those
20 messages to the test CLEC or any other CLEC?

21 MS. CARLA MORREALE: Well, only through our
22 experience with the test CLEC and our receipt of